

**REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 17, 2007.

Claims 8,15, and 20 are amended, claims 1-7 were previously withdrawn, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 8-25 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification paragraphs 9 and 44.

Additionally, Applicant asserts that the amendments are made for purposes of placing the present application in condition for allowance and that a new search is not needed by the Examiner as a result of the amendments. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that entry of the amendments is appropriate.

**§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 8-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Klein et al. (U.S.6,453,313). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an anticipation rejection that each and every limitation must be taught or suggested in the exact detail and identical arrangement in the cited reference.

The Examiner appears to have asserted in the Final Action that because the Klein reference partitions a database as multiple tables on different nodes of a network that parallel processing is achieved when the query is processed by different query processing agents. This is in fact not unique to Klein and is a situation that has existed in the database arts for some time. However, this is not what Applicant has done and is not what Applicant believes was claimed. To highlight this point and avoid any further misinterpretation, the Applicant has amended the pending independent claims.

The claim amendments assert these limitations in one form or another, which are not taught or suggested in any manner in the Klein reference. First, the applications recited in the claims do not process the query they process the results of the query. In Klein, the only parallel processing going on is that with the module or application that is in fact processing the query.

Second, the results are extracted or populated to different queues, each queue associated with a particular application and each queue having a different portion of the query results.

The Klein reference does not teach or suggest in any manner the ability to parse search results by populating different portions of the results to different queues and then having each different application concurrently process its particular queue.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of record with respect to Klein be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

### **Reservation of Rights**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.


If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0225.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(513) 942-0224

Date 10/17/07


By /

  
Joseph P. Mehrle  
Reg. No. 45,535

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 17th of October 2007.

**KIMBERLY BROWN**

Name

  
Signature